HUMAN EVENTS

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVI, No. 32 Wednesday, August 12, 1959 Washington, D. C.

News Section

THE VISIT: *Major diplomatic disaster* ..... (page 1)
NIXON: *Helped or hindered?* ..... (page 2)
DEMOCRATS: *Squirming in labor's grasp* ... (page 2)
LABOR BILL: *Improved but inadequate* ..... (page 2)
EDUCATION: *Prof. Beatnik* ..... (page 3)

Invitation to Khrushchev: The Capital is still trying to recover from the blow dealt by Ike's invitation to Khrushchev. Much double talk and many significant silences conceal from the country muffled discontent on Capitol Hill.

Republicans "button up" their lips; or, if cornered for a statement, all too briefly endorse the bid by Ike. "Liberal" Democrats restrain their jubilation to keep from spoiling the show. Others, like Speaker Sam Rayburn, craftily put the responsibility on the President. Some privately (and some publicly) describe the action as "calamitous."

Styles Bridges, Senior Republican of the Senate, reiterates, "I opposed it [see last week's HUMAN EVENTS]. I still oppose it. I hope that Khrushchev will not be misled by that segment of our population which has often in the past demonstrated toward Russia and the Communist world as a whole and Khrushchev in particular, gullibility, complacency or fear."

Democratic Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut calls the invitation to Khrushchev "a national disgrace." Republican Representative Walter Judd, whose voice on foreign affairs carries more weight than any other House Republican, said the visit is "a major advance for him in his relentless political offensive to soften up the West preparatory to the kill" and predicted that the visit will "strengthen the dictator and weaken his opponents."

Representative August Johansen (R.-Mich.), one of the few who "unbuttoned," remarked, "The Khrushchev invitation reflects incredible confusion, illogic and contradictions. Mr. K. himself gave, in the same breath with his warning, 'We will bury you,' the additional warning, 'If you don't like us, don't invite us to come to see you.' So we invite our self-announced undertaker to call.

"The Congress three weeks ago adopted a resolution expressing its desire for the freedom of the captive nations and now the executive branch extends the honor of a formal invitation to the captor."

Veterans in the press do not pull their punches. Constantine Brown, long-time foreign editor of the Washington *Star,* remarked, "This is the greatest disaster to our foreign policy in a generation." Paul Ward of the Baltimore *Sun,* with 25 years of foreign and diplomatic press experience, heads his story from Geneva, "Europe's Press Reaction Gives Wan, Chinless Image of US." He reports US diplomats humiliated and American friends in Europe embarrassed, to put it mildly. European friends of the US, says Ward, "treat his [Ike's] explanations of it [the invitation to K.] as unworthy of serious consideration including in particular his contention that he is not granting Khrushchev a 'summit meeting.'"

From left to right, the press and commentators agree that Eisenhower, after many months of insisting that he would attend no summit conference, unless "progress" were made at a preliminary Foreign Ministers meeting, caved in. Not a particle of progress was made at the parley in Geneva, because of Soviet obstructionism.

Many in Washington comment that actually Ike has granted Khrushchev a "super summit," a two-man huddle which the Soviet leader probably never hoped to achieve; he undoubtedly was prepared to settle for a four-leader summit in a spot outside the US.

And they recall the speech of Secretary John Foster Dulles to the National Press Club on June 16, 1958, when he warned that if Khrushchev got a meeting with Ike the result might provide the No. 1 Communist "with the greatest triumph of his career."

Military men in the Capital, mindful of the resurgent militancy gained by Khrushchev by the 1955 Geneva summit conference, followed by the butchery in Hungary and the partial take-over by the Reds in the Near East in 1957, eye anxiously the Middle East and Far East—and in the latter: Laos, Korea, Formosa and the attitude of Japan, long wobbling on the Red China recognition issue.

Despite lofty pretensions of nonpartisanship on Capitol Hill, some deadly tools are being forged. HUMAN EVENTS learns that, at a secret huddle of Senate Democrats on August 4, plans were laid for pinning on Ike and the GOP the responsibility for "an American Munich" during the Khrushchev visit.

One consequence of the Khrushchev invite which has drawn little notice in the press is that it has triggered probably the biggest and hastiest exodus from Capitol Hill in history. Members of Congress of both parties now are determined to adjourn before the Russian arrives, so as to avoid the embarrassing prospect of inviting him to go before the assembled members of Congress (*a la* Churchill). "That is the last thing we want," remarked one member, and added, "I'll be away on a long vacation out of this country where I can't be reached." The State Department too recognized this danger and is putting pressure where it can for Congress to close up and go home.

Already, members are calculating how many pieces of legislation may have to be jettisoned because the bills have not already moved far enough through the congressional machinery to be acted upon by the whole Congress. One of these mentioned as likely to fall by the wayside is the civil rights measure.

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nixon: Lively speculation in the Capital concerns Nixon's political future as a result of his Russian trip and the Eisenhower invitation to Khrushchev. Many friends of Nixon entertained grave doubts about his success on a foreign terrain and feared the many pitfalls and hazards.

However, his performance with the Russian dictator "in the kitchen," his "toe-to-toe" debate, and his ready arguments with the Soviet hecklers during the trip lifted—it is no exaggeration to say—the hearts and minds of the mass of the American people. The Trendex News Poll of New York in the latter days of his trip reported that his "Presidential prospects have been increased tremendously by his Russian visit. . . . He is now the favored Republican candidate of 71.5 per cent of the people." The question was put, "Nixon or Rockefeller?" and against Nixon's support by 71.5 per cent Rockefeller showed only 21.2. Nixon's popularity, it was shown, has nearly doubled since last November. This finding is borne out by Capitol Hill soundings among constituents across the land. Surprisingly, in the South, where Nixon has never been liked, Capitol Hill sources report a sudden flare of real enthusiasm for him.

However, the Trendex Poll was taken before the Ike bid to Khrushchev. Observers wonder whether this development will dim the Vice President's acclaim. Arguments revolve around whether Nixon was a party to the President's desire to have Khrushchev come to a summit in the United States. On one occasion, in Siberia, Nixon's press chief denied that the Vice President was pushing for a return visit to the US by Khrushchev.

In Poland, Nixon—when asked if he issued the invitation to Khrushchev—told the press: "I did not. That was initiated by the President himself."

Friends of Nixon in the Capital believe that the Vice President, knowing (while in Russia) something about Ike's plans for a summit, sought to head off a Khrushchev visit to the US, by feeding out a suggestion that a summit should be held in Quebec.

The Baltimore *Sun* correspondent in Geneva reports belief in Europe that the invite to Khrushchev "not only made a Punch and Judy show out his [Nixon's] forensic clash with Khrushchev at Moscow on July 24, but also pictures him as having been taken into the Chief Executive's confidence belatedly and just to keep him from messing up by accident the deal that was then shaping up secretly between President Eisenhower and Khrushchev."

Clergy Speak Out: Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston protested the Khrushchev visit "in behalf of millions of people in Russia and in countries held in bondage and slavery . . . who cannot speak for themselves." Dr. Carl O. McIntire, who heads the International Council of Christian Churches which has long protested appeasement of any sort, called Khrushchev "the chief spokesman of the Devil who repudiates God." Dr. Clyde Kennedy, president of the American Council of Christian Churches, branded the Red tyrant "the bloody butcher of Hungary" and "an international Dillinger." Dr. Kennedy added: "It is our hope that so much opposition will develop that Khrushchev will refuse to come, as he did in Sweden." (In Belmont, Mass., Robert Welch, chairman of the Committee Against Summit Entanglements, said his group will continue to fire protesting petitions to the President, as reported in HUMAN EVENTS for July 22, 1959, thus keeping open a fruitful field for political action.)

Inside the Democratic Party: An internal convulsion in the Democratic party becomes clearly visible on Capitol Hill, as Democratic legislators—elected with the help of labor union funds—are caught in a crossfire as a result of the public demand for a "tough" labor reform bill. On one side, heavy mail from constituents insists that the evils uncovered by the McClellan Committee be thoroughly remedied by legislation before adjournment. On the other side, the labor union lobby pushes for a meaningless and futile bill. "A lot of Congressmen are squirming" is the comment under the Dome.

Reports from out in the country reinforce this impression of trouble between labor union bosses and Democratic politicos. Thus, in Ohio, Governor Michael DiSalle, a long-time "liberal" pro-labor Democrat, finds himself at sharp odds with the union leaders. For one thing, he has proposed a bill to cure labor racketeering, while labor leaders oppose any bill to restrain abuses and even object to a provision penalizing embezzlement.

Also, Governor DiSalle increased workmen's compensation benefits from a $40.25 weekly maximum to $49 and boosted death benefits from $12,000 to $15,000. Yet the AFL-CIO bitterly criticized the Governor's action, accusing him of "selling the injured workers down the river." The labor lobby demanded $54 weekly and death benefits of $18,000. The Governor retorted: "All of our platform pledges have been met . . . the labor leadership seems to be totally unreasonable."

In Michigan, some Democratic legislators have shown spunk—at least temporarily—in trying to buck union political power. State Representative E. D. O'Brien, of Detroit, a regular Democrat, introduced a bill in the legislature to require secret balloting for district delegates in party conventions. The open balloting now permitted allows the delegates to be intimidated by the labor goons. It is through the preponderant power of the union-dominated delegates from Wayne County (Detroit), that Reuther—and his puppet Governor "Soapy" Williams—controls the Democratic party in Michigan. Hence, the demand of O'Brien (who rebels against union control) for secret balloting.

Twenty-nine Democratic representatives—a surprising number—in the House joined with Republicans to pass the O'Brien bill by a big majority; and the Senate followed suit. Williams then vetoed it.

The Governor had a clear-cut choice on this issue: to sign as a true Democrat; or to veto it, as a union-controlled politician. He chose the latter—further evidence of his allegiance to Reuther.

Labor Front: The Landrum-Griffin bill (backed by the White House) is attracting much conservative support. It has provisions which hold promise of solving such problems as organizational and recognition picket-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing, secondary boycotts and the "no-man's land" area of labor dispute jurisdiction (that is, it authorizes state courts and agencies to handle disputes which are local in character over which jurisdiction is declined by NLRB). It is immeasurably better than the "sweetheart" bill reported by the House Labor Committee.

However, it does not strike at the center of labor union power—the use of labor funds for political purposes, the commanding strength of labor monopoly and the special privileges and immunities enjoyed by organized labor. Not a few on the Hill believe it would be better if no bill at all passed the Congress, rather than to have a half-way measure like the Landrum-Griffin bill, provided, of course, that the labor lobby is forced to bear the responsibility for killing legislation. A very complicated parliamentary fight is anticipated in the House.

● The "work rules and assignments" issue, which is the big factor in the failure of steel management and union to reach a settlement in the strike, is popping up in other labor disputes. Featherbedding which—HUMAN EVENTS has pointed out—had been long associated principally with the building construction and railroad industries, actually has spread through most unionized industry in the country. Now, Washington notices, the strike by four locals of the AFL-CIO's Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union against four refineries of the Standard Oil of Indiana Company reveals the same pattern.

The company, in a release issued on July 28, states: "In all these [four] strikes, wages have not been an issue. A five per cent general wage increase was granted to these unions earlier this year. The basic issue is whether management or the union is to determine how many people are employed and at what work they are employed.

" . . . At the Texas City and Sugar Creek refineries supervisory forces [with the workers out on strike] are operating the plants at about 25 to 50 per cent of capacity. We are serving all our customers without shortage of products and expect to continue to do so." It is obvious that featherbedding is afflicting the oil industry.

● The skeleton in Reuther's closet has been rattling again rather loudly—as reported in HUMAN EVENTS on July 15, 1959. According to *Newsweek* (August 3), the four Republican Senators on the McClellan Rackets Committee "came up with a classified 1,000 word document linking a top Reuther aide, senior UAW Vice President Richard T. Gosser of Toledo, Ohio, with kited invoices, slot-machine profiteering, salary kickbacks, misappropriation of union funds and goon squads." The document is now before the Rackets Committee.

Whether the Rackets Committee, under the management of Robert Kennedy (brother of Senator John F. Kennedy), will do anything about this matter remains to be seen. With the close of the session approaching and the early termination of the Rackets Committee itself, observers doubt that any action will be taken. If that should prove to be the case, the desire of Presidential "hopeful" Kennedy not to offend Walter Reuther before the Democratic convention will be mentioned again and again and again.

Capitol Camera: Despite the observation by labor boss Walter Reuther that Nelson Rockefeller would make a good Democrat, members of that party are not convinced. Even they—the traditional big spending champs—are alarmed at the manner in which Nelson tosses the taxpayers' money around in New York.

The other day, the Democratic state chairman said that if the Governor had a genuine interest in economy, he could start "by cutting back on the $1 million now being passed out to a bewildering complex of overlapping and unnecessary commissions. He can also take steps to reduce the $100,000 press staff he has gathered around him to promote his Presidential ambitions."

● From New York comes news that friends of former Governor Thomas Dewey show nervousness about the coming (October) appearance of a book by Jules Abels of Washington. In 1956, Abels wrote the best-selling book, *The Truman Scandals*. His new work will deal with the surprising 1948 Presidential election. It will be entitled *Out of the Jaws of Victory*, which reveals Abels' theme: that Dewey snatched defeat out of what everyone expected to be a GOP victory. Republicans who have read advance proofs of the Abels book draw one conclusion: never again should a "liberal" New York Governor be selected as Presidential nominee of the GOP.

● Prize for political naivete goes to Senator Estes Kefauver (D.-Tenn.). He said that, when he was touring Russia with a group of Senators a few years ago, he was amazed at Khrushchev's knowledge of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Kefauver apparently does not realize that the American Communists have long considered the TVA as the type of collectivization which, if extended, would turn the US into a Socialist state. (See "The Real Truth About TVA" in HUMAN EVENTS for August 5, 1959.)

In a letter to President Eisenhower, Kefauver urged that the TVA be included in the itinerary of Khrushchev when he visits the US next month. Capitol Hill comment: "In that way, Nikita will see that our children (he won't have to wait for our grandchildren) are already living under socialism."

Education: The teaching profession recently hit a new academic low at Maryland State Teachers College in Towson, Maryland. There, as part of a post-graduate summer course, 100 public school instructors were lectured on "The Philosophy of Modern Youth" by one Pete Merriman—a bearded beatnik.

"Well, cuties," Merriman opened to his audience composed mostly of young women, "I appreciate the opportunity of bringing the way of life to you." Then he launched into a description of the characteristics of beatniks, described by him as outsiders banding together to form an inside for themselves.

In beatnik language, Merriman informed the teachers, "Every group has its cat phrases they alone use. It gives them a certain mysticism."

Explaining the beatnik uniform, he said, "I wear a suit when my clothes get dirty. Why wear underwear? It's just an extra pair of pants to put on."

The teachers learned from their "lecturer" that, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the field of music, recording artist "Dave Brubeck now is almost way out. Thelonious Monk is farther out. He blows a mean set of drums."

Significantly, the Baltimore *Sun* reporter, who covered the story, was unable to find a single teacher in attendance who was willing to give him her name.

Legislation by Decree: A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to set up national parks on his own initiative has aroused considerable opposition, even among "liberals."

The proposal of Senator Richard Neuberger (D.-Oreg.) lets the Secretary take 100,000 acres in any three sites at his discretion, and declare them national parks without consulting either the Congress or the residents of the area. Francis Biddle, former US Attorney General and one of the leading lights of the New Deal, points out that the Neuberger bill, ostensibly designed to save the Cape Cod shoreline by making it a national park, will actually let the Interior Department destroy over 500 homes in the process, turning the historic community into a picnic grounds.

Biddle notes that sensible bills making only the Cape's shore area a national park have been before the Congress for months, but a House subcommittee is still trying to get Interior Secretary Fred Seaton to report on them. Seaton, who favors taking the Cape lock, stock and barrel, is thus holding up the bills. Meanwhile Neuberger introduces a plan to give Seaton power to designate parks by fiat, justifying this complete break with the precedent—that Congress authorizes all national parks—on the basis that the *Congress* has pigeonholed the bills!

The maneuver is apparently too much for even some "liberals" to stomach. Biddle echoes what conservatives long said of New Deal proposals: "The issue raised by this bill poses the spectre of Government by remote control."

Segregation: The NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People), in its all-out campaign for total integration of the schools in the South, is making dupes of parents of Negro children. Reports from Virginia say that several parents, who now find themselves involved in law suits demanding the transfer of their children to a white high school, did not know what they were signing when they authorized a desegregation suit to be filed last spring.

One mother says that she thought she was endorsing an effort by an NAACP lawyer to get local authorities to build a new all-Negro high school for the Floyd, Virginia, area.

Commented the Washington *Star* on the disclosures: "This is not the first instance, however, in which parents in Virginia cases have said they did not know what they were signing, and this is wrong. The NAACP representatives, or whoever acts in behalf of the parents, ought to explain fully to them the nature of the suits—especially in communities in which desegregation can be expected to lead to closed schools for both white and colored."

Between Covers: Conservatives throughout the country will be reading *Right or Wrong*, essays by Father Richard Ginder, a booklet of 128 pages, $1, published by Our Sunday Visitor Press (Huntington, Indiana), just issued and obtainable at that address. Vividly written, with ample documentation, it will prove an absolutely indispensable handbook of news and views on the anti-Communist struggle.

Father Ginder for many years has been Associate Editor and columnist for Our Sunday Visitor, *which is the largest Catholic clergy journal in the country (net paid circulation, 924,700).*

Through many brilliant chapters, the author gives valuable, searching, yet succinct analyses of the Americans for Democratic Action, and the National Committee for an Effective Congress, two of the Left Wing's most active groups. He also offers many pages of excellent revisionist literature. But, above all, *Right or Wrong* is a handbook for those wanting political action. Such chapters as "Know your Enemy," "Action at the Grass Roots," "What Can I Do?" and "Hear Ye, Hear Ye" provide a mine of practical advice.

Erratum: Mutual Broadcasting System commentator Charles Warren recently reported that Joseph F. Finnegan, head of the Federal Mediation and Concilation Service, in answer to a reporter's question about a full page advertisement run by the Joint Committee of Steel Firms, said: "That stuff is the same old bunk. It's a rehash of the same old mishmash." HUMAN EVENTS picked up the quote in its issue of July 29, identifying Warren as the source of the report. Subsequently, Warren announced that he had been mistaken, and that the quote should have been attributed to David McDonald, boss of the United Steelworkers Union.

Excerpt from letter of REV. H. H. STEWART, First Brethren Church, Portis, Kans., to Warren Zimmerman, who sent him a gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS: "I surely do appreciate HUMAN EVENTS. It is just tops with me. I can hardly put it down until I've finished it. The outlook still looks pretty dark, but surely the efforts of yourself and others like you will ultimately make an impression on our people."

FRED EISSLER, retired teacher, Philadelphia, Pa.: "Anyone with the HUMAN EVENTS habit cannot retire. Your live news reporting keeps me on my toes from early Monday all through the week. My wife and I hope that you will be able to keep up your patriotic efforts for many years to come."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Vol. XVI, No. 32 HUMAN EVENTS August 12, 1959

Article Section

The following is a condensation of a chapter from "Brain Washing in the High Schools," by E. Merrill Root, Professor of English at Earlham College. It is one of the most important books on education to appear in years, and copies should be placed in the hands of all persons having influence over our public education systems. Buy copies for your school superintendent, members of your Board of Education, teachers, your public library and friends. Bring it to the attention of PTA presidents. The book, "Brain Washing in the High Schools," may be purchased, at $4.50 per copy, from HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Brain Washing in the High Schools

By E. MERRILL ROOT

THE ELEVEN TEXTBOOKS which we will examine are published by some of the largest and most respected publishers. At least some of them are used in the high schools of every state in the Union. The state of Tennessee, for example, includes eight of the eleven on its approved lists.

The complete list of books is as follows:

AVERY CRAVEN and WALTER JOHNSON: *The United States—Experiment in Democracy* (Ginn and Company, 1950).

LEON H. CANFIELD and HOWARD B. WILDER: *The Making of Modern America* (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1952).

LEWIS PAUL TODD and MERLE CURTI: *America's History* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1950).

RUTH WOOD GAVIAN and WILLIAM A. HAMM: *The American Story* (D. C. Heath and Company, 1951).

RALPH VOLNEY HARLOW: *Story of America* (Henry Holt and Company, 1951).

DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY: *A History of Our Country* (Ginn and Company, 1950).

DWIGHT L. DUMOND, EDWARD E. DALE, and EDGAR B. WESLEY: *History of United States* (D. C. Heath and Company, 1948).

FREMONT P. WIRTH: *United States History* (American Book Company, 1952).

HAROLD UNDERWOOD FAULKNER, TYLER KEPNER, and EDWARD H. MERRILL: *History of the American Way* (Harper & Brothers, 1950).

HENRY W. BRAGDON and SAMUEL P. McCUTCHEN: *History of a Free People* (The Macmillan Company, 1954).

LILIAN T. MOWRER and HOWARD H. CUMMINGS: *The United States and World Relations* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1952).

These books are the core of American history as taught in the Evanston Township High School of Evanston, Illinois, one of the largest high schools in the United States.

History of the Free People, by Bragdon and McCutchen, *was introduced after 1952, after private individuals had exerted pressure because, they said, of the commitment of the other texts to collectivism.*

With this qualified exception (Bragdon and McCutchen do not even mention Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, or other Communist infiltrators on high government levels, and they label attempts to curb subversion as "hysteria" and "a Red scare"), these texts, with varying emphases and techniques, take not an individualistic but a "social" view of American history. *All* tend to idolize "the common man" (a phrase so prevalent as to become a cliche), "the masses," or "Mr. Average Citizen." Many of them, as we shall see, frankly interpret American history, from colonial days to the present, as a class struggle.

MOST SIGNIFICANT is what they do to the Constitution, the very soul of our Republic, our chief safeguard against a coercive, monolithic, dictatorial state, against the pressures of factions and special interests. Because it is a safeguard, social democrats of all kinds—from the dove-gentle Fabians to the serpent-wise Communists—dislike the Constitution as an obstacle to their aims.

Ever since Charles Beard wrote *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* in 1913, his thesis that the Constitution was a rich man's plot has been the orthodox and prevailing thesis. It has been the thesis officially accepted and taught *ex cathedra* by all "right-thinking" conformists in our schools and colleges. It has dominated the colleges, the schools, the teachers, the texts; to question it has been heresy.

A stealthy nemesis has at last caught up with Beard. Professor Robert E. Brown, of Michigan State University, was brought up, like the authors of these texts, to conform to Beard. But Brown is a natural rebel, and in his *Charles Beard and the Constitution* (Princeton University Press, 1956) he provides facts that controvert Beard and that demolish the class-based theories of the texts we are studying; he found, for example:

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1. *Property was widely diffused throughout the people at large in all the colonies that became states.*

2. Probably most free adult men had the vote. (Thus, to talk—as these texts often do—of the people not speaking until Jefferson and Jackson were elected is erroneous.)

3. *Ninety-seven per cent of the people lived in the country: freehold qualifications admitted small farmers and debtors to the vote.*

4. Ninety per cent of the people owned land.

5. *Among the three per cent of city dwellers, propertyless mechanics in most places had the vote.*

ONE CANNOT READ Brown's book without being convinced that the people of the United States —not the "rich" and not the "poor," not the "classes" and not the "masses," but the people in the indivisible Nation—were solidly behind the Constitution. It expressed their will, their desire, their philosophy. The delegates knew this and did what the people wanted done. The people knew that their will had been done well, so they ratified the Constitution.

But let us see what these texts say about the Constitution.

Of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Craven and Johnson say (pp. 138-139): "Since there was no such thing as a popular will in 1787, it is difficult to say convincingly that the Constitution was made against the wishes of the people. The term *popular will* (italics in original) had little real significance until the time of Andrew Jackson."

The innuendo is perfectly clear: that the Constitution was "made against the wishes of the people." If not, why do they even say that "it is difficult to say convincingly" that it is so? Why even raise the question? The fact is that the majority of all free males could vote.

Craven and Johnson consider the greatest virtue in the Constitution the fact that—it can be amended! They say (p. 139), "By incorporating a method of amending the Constitution, unwieldy as it proved to be, the framers gave the future an opportunity to alter the document to fit a changing society." They do not seem to realize that a particular virtue of the "unwieldy" method of changing the Constitution is that it keeps us from making fickle and alien changes.

While *History of United States* by Dumond, Dale, and Wesley does not so drastically present the thesis that the Constitution was designed to check "democracy," it moves in much the same direction.

The authors state that a great virtue of the Constitution is that it is "flexible": " . . . by the addition of amendments from time to time, [the Constitution] has served our country well for over 150 years." (p. 183) So their approval is more for the amendments which change the Constitution than it is for the Constitution itself, which holds the country on a steady course. In general, the authors believe that the champions of "democracy," against the class interests of the "gentry" (of whom George Washington was one), were responsible for whatever good there is in the Constitution.

CLASS INTERPRETATION of our Constitution, in terms of what one must call economic determinism, is continued in *History of the American Way,* by Faulkner, Kepner, and Merrill. They tell us (p. 71) that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention were "slow to change"—the reason being that they belonged to "the property-holding class." "Fearing democracy and feeling that the interests of the well-to-do would be safer . . . " the delegates, we're told, did this and that—always in the interests of "property" and "the upper class." In "Information Please!", which suggests topics for students at the end of each chapter, we are asked (p. 87): "Why did the members of the Constitutional Convention turn out to be mostly conservative?" All the delegates had just been engaged in the most radical proceedings in human history—the American Revolution. But the textbook authors will not be deflected by facts; they assure us:

" . . . many believed [who were the "many"?] that too much attention had been given to the protection of the rights of property . . . the centering of power in the hands of 'aristocrats' or wealthy property holders would develop a government with little sympathy for the 'lowborn.' In short, not only was little democracy provided for in the Constitution but there was danger that the common man might become the 'forgotten man.'" (p. 75)

The authors sum up the struggle thus:

"Because the new Constitution failed to emphasize democracy, it was accepted only after a bitter fight." (p. 70)

This is misleading. The Constitution fully supplied a republican form of government, on a democratic footing, and while there were differences of opinion, careful consideration, and long debate, who would have it otherwise? Is this not the procedure of true American democracy in the town meeting or the forum?

Faulkner, Kepner, and Merrill are peculiarly interested in amending the Constitution. They offer a major subheading (p. 84) which reads, "Through Amendments and Laws the Constitution Changes with the Times." They do not understand that the greatness of the Constitution is not that it can change with the times but that it stands with Eternity.

Faulkner, Kepner, and Merrill consider that the good of America lies not so much in the essential truth of the Constitution as in the changes—some good, some bad—which have been made in it. They entitle chapter five "We move by changes in the Constitution toward a more perfect Democracy." Under this heading, they say:

> The Constitution as made by the fathers provided for a limited democracy only. Immediately the people demanded a written guarantee of their rights. The Bill of Rights was added at once to protect these rights—usually called civil liberties. (p. 90)

Several corrections are needed. If the Constitution "provided for a limited democracy only," it was done deliberately and wisely, as Jefferson suggested, to provide for that "equal law" which "must protect" the "equal rights" which a minority possesses. Also, what do these authors mean by "the people" who immediately "demanded a written guarantee of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their rights"? The truth is that most of the delegates, and especially a few keen intellectuals like Jefferson, realized that the Constitution was unfinished. To add particular items was a natural outgrowth of the Constitution itself. To describe the Bill of Rights as a "popular" uprising against an antidemocratic document is false. If you simply read the provisions of the Bill of Rights, you will see that they—even more specifically than anything in the Constitution itself—uphold the right of private property. Thus the Fifth Amendment—that last refuge of desperate men—is seldom or never quoted to the end. If you look at it, you find this:

> . . . nor shall any person . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law . . .

To reinforce this, the Amendment concludes:

> . . . nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Now, here is a peculiar thing never mentioned by any of these textbook authors. The Constitution proper is supposed to have been fashioned by the "rich" to uphold the rights of property; the Bill of Rights is supposed to have been fashioned by the "poor" to protect themselves against the rich. Yet the Constitution itself no where mentions the rights of property; the Bill of Rights specifically upholds the rights of property. The Bill of Rights is thus quite clearly concerned with the rights of "private property." Why do none of these texts state that fact?

Faulkner, Kepner, and Merrill go on to say:

> As the idea of democracy grew, increased political rights were granted by changes in the Constitution. Finally, certain amendments were added which aimed directly at promoting the general welfare. And so the Constitution has gradually been made more democratic. (p. 90)

This assumes that the Constitution, in itself, was not "democratic" enough; it assumes, also, that all changes meant "increased political rights." This is not so. Did the Eighteenth (Prohibition) Amendment bring "increased political rights"—or increased personal rights? It was so bad an invasion of personal liberties that it had to be repealed. Did the Income Tax Amendment bring "increased political rights"?—or even increased economic rights? It has been extended and ramified until it is a millstone around the neck of the American people, and already there is agitation for its repeal as well as for its limitation.

Finally, the authors insinuate in their statements of approval of amendments to the Constitution and distrust of the Constitution itself a sly bit of propaganda for the welfare state. Amendments always (to them) have been "aimed directly at promoting the general welfare." But the Constitution itself, and especially the Bill of Rights, which they specifically praise, were aimed primarily at promoting individual freedom first, in the belief that "the general welfare" follows freedom. Each of the items of the Bill of Rights was aimed against swollen prerogatives of Government. Not one of them, to promote the "general welfare" tells Government that it shall do something to bring bread and circuses to the people. Each of them is a warning to the Government to keep hands off the people and to let them work out their own life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, in their own way and through their own initiative. But the authors, contrary to fact, declare that the Constitution has "gradually been made more democratic" as it appears to them to approach the welfare state.

GAVIAN AND HAMM, in *The American Story*, also interpret the Constitution in terms of the clash of classes and rich versus poor. They say:

> The majority of the 55 delegates were lawyers, most of them with considerable experience in public life. There were also wealthy landowners, planters, money-lenders, and merchants, and a sprinkling of college professors, physicians, and retired ministers. The delegates represented the conservative, propertied class. (p. 103)

A commentary on this is unnecessary if one will read the Constitution. The Preamble says:

> We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

If this be "conservatism," make the most of it—for it is a statement that seeks justice, the common defense, the general welfare, and the blessings of liberty. After the Preamble, one may read the Constitution itself, section by section, item by item: no section and no item seeks to make the powerful of the earth more powerful; every section and every item is sensitive to human rights and valiant to defend them. The framers were conservatives in the root sense; they were conservationists who sought to conserve the spiritual resources and vital meaning of the Revolution in a document which should perpetuate that Revolution. To attack them as men of "the conservative, propertied classes" and the Constitution as a class document is to attack the goal and culmination of the American Revolution itself.

Wirth adds a curious justification of the Constitutional Convention and the Bill of Rights. He does not so much stress the economic determinism alleged to be behind its framers as he justifies it by its amendments, emendations and changes. And he views its importance as lying in the fact that it fused the individual states into a Federal union—which, to him, is a prototype of the United Nations.

Todd and Curti join in the anvil chorus. They are cautious and circumspect in their interpretation of the Constitutional Convention, but they make their bias clear. They speak of the delegates as "men of property and position,"—as if that made them conspirators against the common welfare.

The authors go on to speak (p. 173) of the Constitution's "elaborate provisions to safeguard property holders." They say of the delegates that they were "determined to keep the control of the Government in the hands of the well-to-do . . . " They say (p. 174), with evident disrelish, that "the founders of the Nation made it clear that they were not trying to establish what we call democracy —Government of and by all the people."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMPLETE REBUTTAL of what they say of the Constitution's "elaborate provisions to safeguard property holders" exists in the crystal integrity of the Constitution itself. Now, consider the Constitution's statement as to who may be Senators. The Senate, supposedly, is more removed from the people themselves than the House of Representatives is; yet the sole qualifications for Senator are these:

> No person shall be senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

Do these constitute "elaborate provisions to safeguard property holders"?

Are there such elaborate provisions in the parts of the Constitution concerning the Judiciary? Article III, on the Judicial Department of the United States Constitution, says:

> The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State, the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

In relation to the Executive, there still are no "elaborate provisions to safeguard property holders." In Article II, Section I, item d, we have this:

> No person except a natural born citizen, or a citizen of the United States, at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.

Nothing here seems designed to "keep the control of the Government in the hands of the well-to-do."

It is obvious that Todd and Curti know, but quail from the fact, that the founding fathers meant to establish not a "democracy" but a republic. They say (p. 173), "It is . . . clear that they did *not* intend to establish immediately what we today call a democracy. . . . " (Italics in original.) The key word, which is a weasel word, is "*immediately.*" One can only infer that even the founding fathers desired, after a pause for probation, that the republic should evolve into a "democracy." The father to this thought is the *wish* that the founding fathers had been adherents of a class "democracy."

TODD AND CURTI say (loc. cit.) that "only a minority of men were eligible" for participation in the Government. Yet the qualifications for a Representative, a Senator, or the President himself were not property qualifications. "Nevertheless, the founders of the Nation feared even this relatively small group of the people." What bounders our founding fathers were! The truth is that the founding fathers were not distrustful of the people, but they were expressing the people's distrust of an entrenched central Government.

Canfield and Wilder's analysis of the forces that opposed ratification of the Constitution stresses class distinctions—in terms of economic status. They say:

> Those who wanted it [the Constitution] adopted called themselves Federalists. Those who opposed it were called anti-Federalists. The Federalist group was made up of conservative property owners and businessmen. Among them were owners of government bonds, the commercial and manufacturing interests, the planter class, lawyers, and officers of the late army. . . .
>
> Most of the anti-Federalists were people who did not own extensive property. Among them were the small farmers, the laborers in the cities, people who owed money, people who believed in issuing plenty of paper money, those who wanted a more democratic form of Government. . . . (p. 137)

THIS IS A QUEER MELANGE. Owners of government bonds are lumped with the antidemocratic; so are businessmen, simply because of their guilt by association with "commercial and manufacturing interests," planters, and officers "of the late army." (The "late army"—including, one must suppose, its officers—had just fought the Revolution!) Also, those who sought inflation ("people who believed in issuing plenty of paper money") are approved of as virtuous worthies "who wanted a more democratic form of Government." But the best answer to the fissioning of Americans into battling economic classes lies in Jefferson's own words: "But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle." This setting of Federalist against anti-Federalist is the sort of thing that Jefferson deplored: "We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists."

It is an ironic fact, seldom noticed by today's "liberals," that they, the "liberals," are closest to the Federalists. For it is today's "liberals" who regard "government" as the chief agent of human progress. Today's "liberals" chronically oppose states' rights and stubbornly seek ever-greater Federal control. They are the Federalists of today. Thomas Jefferson, on the contrary, would today be opposing excessive taxation, the crushing of states' rights, the growing Federal control of once-free men.

If the facts are given in the framework of the whole, the Constitutional Convention was one of the purest episodes in human history.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "BRAIN WASHING IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED